arXiv:1409.5609v1 [math.CO] 19 Sep 2014

Bounding the Porous Exponential Domination Number of Apollonian Networks *

Joshua Beverly Mariah Farley Christopher McClain Felicia Stover
Concord University

September 22, 2014

MSC: 05C12, 05C69
Key words: graph theory, domination, Apollonian network

Abstract

Given a graph G with vertex set V, a subset S of V is a dominating set if every vertex in V is either in S or adjacent to some vertex in S. The size of a smallest dominating set is called the domination number of G. We study a variant of domination called porous exponential domination in which each vertex v of V is assigned a weight by each vertex s of S that decreases exponentially as the distance between v and s increases. S is a porous exponential dominating set for G if all vertices in S distribute to vertices in G a total weight of at least 1. The porous exponential domination number of G is the size of a smallest porous exponential dominating set. In this paper we compute bounds for the porous exponential domination number of special graphs known as Apollonian networks.

1 Introduction

Exponential domination was first introduced in [3] and further studied in [1]. Apollonian networks and their applications were independently introduced in [2] and [4], and further studied in [8] and [9]. We refer the reader to [5] and [6] for a comprehensive treatment of the topic of domination in graphs and its many variants. General graph theoretic notation and terminology may be found in [7]. Given a graph G, we denote its set of vertices by $V(G)$ and its set of edges by $E(G)$. The degree of a vertex v in G is denoted by $d_G(v)$. The distance in G between vertices x and y, denoted by $d_G(x, y)$, is defined to be the length of a shortest path in G that joins x and y, if such a path exists, and infinity otherwise. The diameter of G, denoted $diam(G)$, is the largest such distance: $diam(G) = \max\{d_G(x, y) \mid x, y \in V(G)\}$.

Let G be a graph, $S \subseteq V(G)$, and $v \in V(G)$. The *porous exponential domination weight* of S at v is

$$w_S^*(v) = \sum_{u \in S} \frac{1}{2^{d(u,v)-1}}$$

and S is a *porous exponential dominating set* for G if $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$ for all $v \in V(G)$. The size of a smallest porous exponential dominating set for G is the *porous exponential domination number* of G. and is denoted by $\gamma_e^*(G)$. These definitions were first introduced in [3], although that paper is primarily concerned with another variant, $\gamma_e(G)$, called the *nonporous exponential domination number* of G. The key difference between porous exponential domination and nonporous exponential domination is whether the distribution of weights from S may "pass through" other vertices in S, as is evidenced by the slightly different definition of nonporous weight:

$$w_S(v) = \begin{cases} \sum_{u \in S} \frac{1}{2^{f(u,v)-1}} & \text{if } v \notin S \\ 2 & \text{if } v \in S \end{cases}$$

*Research partially funded by CURM, the Center for Undergraduate Research, and NSF grant DMS-1148695

where $f(u,v)$ is defined to be the length of a shortest path joining u and v in the subgraph induced by $V(G) \setminus (S \setminus \{u\})$ if such a path exists, and infinity otherwise. It is clear that $\gamma_e^*(G) \leq \gamma_e(G)$.

Having defined porous exponential domination, we now define Apollonian networks. Let G_1 be a complete graph on three vertices and let $U_1 = V(G_1)$. Let G_2 be a complete graph on four vertices such that $U_1 \subseteq V(G_2)$, and let $U_2 = V(G_2) \setminus V(G_1)$. For $k > 2$ we define G_k and U_k recursively by extending G_{k-1} and U_{k-1} as follows: for each $u \in U_{k-1}$, and for each adjacent pair $\{x, y\}$ of neighbors of u in G_{k-1}, we create a new vertex $v \in U_k$ that is adjacent to each of u, x, y in G_k. (Consequently, u, v, x, and y are all pairwise adjacent in G_k.) We call G_k the *kth Apollonian network*, and for $1 \leq j \leq k$, we call U_j the *jth generation* of vertices in G_k. Note that $V(G_k) = \bigcup_{j=1}^{k} U_j$ and $U_k = V(G_k) \setminus V(G_{k-1})$. This recursive process is more easily visualized by starting with a particular planar embedding of G_1 and obtaining G_k from G_{k-1} by adding a new vertex to each interior face and triangulating, as shown in Figures 1 through 4. We note, however, that our formal definition above does not depend upon the planar embedding.



Figure 1: G_1



Figure 2: G_2



Figure 3: G_3



Figure 4: G_4

Before stating our main results, we record a few elementary facts based upon our construction of G_k and observation of small cases:

Remark 1.1. $|U_1| = 3$, $|U_k| = 3^{k-2}$ *for* $k > 1$, *and* $|V(G_k)| = \sum_{j=1}^{k} U_j = 3 + \sum_{j=0}^{k-2} 3^j = \frac{3^{k-1}+5}{2}$.

Remark 1.2. $|E(G_k)| = 3 + \sum_{j=2}^{k} 3|U_j| = 3 + \sum_{j=2}^{k} 3^{j-1} = \frac{3^k+3}{2}$.

Remark 1.3. *Since every vertex in* $V(G_3)$ *is adjacent to the single vertex in* U_2, *we know that* $\gamma_e^*(G_3) = 1$.

Remark 1.4. *Let* S *be any pair of vertices from* $V(G_2)$. *Since every vertex in* $V(G_5)$ *is adjacent to at least one of the vertices in* $V(G_2)$ *and every pair of vertices in* $V(G_2)$ *is adjacent, we know that every vertex of* $V(G_5)$ *is within distance 2 of both vertices in* S *and therefore* $\gamma_e^*(G_5) = 2$. *(See Figure 5.)*

We further invite the reader to verify our observations and computations for the order, diameter, and porous exponential domination number of G_k for $k \leq 7$, as presented in Table 1 below.



Figure 5: G_5

k	$\lvert V(G_k)\rvert$	$\lvert E(G_k)\rvert$	$diam(G_k)$	$\gamma_e^*(G_k)$
1	3	3	1	1
2	4	6	1	1
3	7	15	2	1
4	16	42	3	2
5	43	123	3	2
6	124	366	4	3
7	367	1095	5	3

Table 1: Observations for G_k, $k \leq 7$

2 Main Results

In Remark 1.4 we compute $\gamma_e^*(G_5) = 2$ by observation, but as k increases, the number of vertices increases exponentially and γ_e^* becomes increasingly difficult to compute by brute force. Thus, our main results in this paper are upper and lower bounds for $\gamma_e^*(G_k)$. For all $k \geq 6$ we show that U_{k-3} is a porous exponential dominating set for G_k, which proves the following:

Theorem 2.1. *For $k \geq 6$, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq 3^{k-5}$.*

We can improve upon this bound for $k \geq 11$ by constructing a porous exponential dominating set using all of the vertices of a smaller Apollonian network rather than just a generation. In particular, we dominate G_k with $V(G_{k-7})$ and prove the following:

Theorem 2.2. *For $k \geq 10$, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq \frac{3^{k-8}+5}{2}$.*

To establish a lower bound, we apply a theorem from [3] that bounds $\gamma_e^*(G)$ from below in terms of $diam(G)$. In order to do this, we compute $diam(G_k)$ for all k. This establishes the following:

Theorem 2.3. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \geq \left\lceil \frac{2k+5}{12} \right\rceil$.*

Before we can prove these theorems, we need some basic results about Apollonian networks.

3 Apollonian Networks

All of the vertices in G_2 are adjacent to each other, but for larger values of k, the adjacencies are more restrictive. Recall that x is a *neighbor* of y in G if x is adjacent to y in G, and the set of y's neighbors in G is the *neighborhood* of y in G, denoted $N_G(y)$.

Lemma 3.1. *For all $k \geq 2$, and for every vertex v in U_k,*
(i) v has no neighbor in U_k
(ii) v has a neighbor in U_{k-1}
(iii) v has exactly 3 distinct neighbors in $V(G_{k-1})$ and these vertices are also pairwise adjacent.
(iv) For all $r < k$ and for all $u \in U_r$, if u is adjacent to v then $|N_{G_k}(u) \cap N_{G_k}(v)| = 2$.
(v) if $r < k$ and v has more than one neighbor in U_r, then $r = 1$

Proof. Parts (i), (ii), and (iii) follow directly from the construction of G_k because when a new vertex v is added to U_k, it is made adjacent to a vertex u of U_{k-1} and two of u's neighbors in $V(G_{k-1})$, say n_1 and n_2. By part (iii), if one of v's neighbors is u, then the other two are neighbors of both u and v, and (iv) follows. We prove (v) by contradiction. Suppose that $1 < r < k$ and two of u, n_1, and n_2 are in U_r. We know that $u \in U_{k-1}$, so if $k - 1 = r > 1$ then $n_1, n_2 \notin U_r$ by part (i). If $1 < r < k - 1$ then it must be that n_1 and n_2 are the two vertices in U_r. But by the construction of G_{k-1}, all three of u's neighbors in G_{k-2} (including n_1 and n_2) must be adjacent. This contradicts (i) for $n_1 \in U_r$ since $r > 1$. □

Corollary 3.2. *For all $k \geq 4$ and for every vertex $v \in U_k$, v has at least one neighbor in $V(G_{k-3})$.*

Proof. By Lemma 3.1 part (iii), v has exactly 3 distinct neighbors in $V(G_{k-1})$, and these vertices are also pairwise adjacent. Denote these vertices by n_1, n_2, and n_3, and suppose that $n_1 \in U_r$, $n_2 \in U_s$, and $n_3 \in U_t$, where $r \leq s \leq t \leq k - 1$. Since $k \geq 4$, then $k - 3 \geq 1$ and if $r > k - 3$ then by pigeonhole principle, two of r, s, and t must be equal which contradicts Lemma 3.1 part (i). Therefore $r \leq k - 3$ and $n_1 \in V(G_{k-3})$. □

Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $r \leq k$, and $v \in U_r$, define $P_k(v) = \{\{x, y\} \mid x \in U_k \text{ and } v, x, \text{ and } y \text{ are pairwise adjacent}\}$. This is the set of pairs of vertices, at least one of which is from the kth generation, that form triangles with v in G_k, the very same triangles that will anchor the $(k+1)$st generation of vertices. By the construction of G_{k+1}, there is a one-to-one corespondence between $P_k(v)$ and the $(k+1)$st generation neighbors of v. It follows that $|P_k(v)| = |N_{G_{k+1}}(V) \cap U_{k+1}|$, in other words the number of $(k+1)$st generation neighbors of v. The next lemma states that the number of such neighbors doubles with every generation.

Lemma 3.3. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $r \leq k$, and for all $v \in U_r$, $|P_{k+1}(v)| = 2|P_k(v)|$.*

Proof. By the construction of G_{k+1}, there is a one-to-one corespondence between $P_k(v)$ and the $(k+1)$st generation neighbors of v. It follows that the members of $P_{k+1}(v)$ are precisely the pairs $\{z,x\}$ and $\{z,y\}$ where $z \in U_{k+1} \cap N_{G_{k+1}}(v)$ and $\{x,y\} \in P_k(v)$. □

Corollary 3.4. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $r \leq k$, and for all $v \in U_r$.*

$$|P_k(v)| = \begin{cases} 3(2^{k-r}) & \text{when } r > 1 \\ 2^{k-1} & \text{when } r = 1 \end{cases}$$

Proof. We proceed by induction on k. If $k = 1$ then $r = 1$, then indeed for all $v \in U_1$, $|P_1(v)| = 1 = 2^{1-1}$. If $k > 1$ and $r = 1$ then, by Lemma 3.3, $|P_k(v)| = 2|P_{k-1}(v)| = 2(2^{k-2}) = 2^{k-1}$ by inductive hypothesis. If $k = 2$ and $r = 2$ then for the single vertex $v \in U_2$, $|P_2(v)| = 3 = 3(2^{1-1})$. If $k > 2$ and $r > 1$ then, by Lemma 3.3, $|P_k(v)| = 2|P_{k-1}(v)| = 2(3(2^{(k-1)-r})) = 3(2^{k-r})$ by inductive hypothesis. □

Corollary 3.5. *For all $k \geq 2$, and for all $v \in V(G_{k-1})$, v has a neighbor in U_k.*

Proof. By the construction of G_k there is a one-to-one corespondence between $P_{k-1}(v)$ and the kth generation neighbors of v. By Corollary 3.4 $|P_{k-1}(v)|$ is nonnegative, and therefore v has a neighbor in U_k. □

Corollary 3.6. *For all $k \geq 2$, and for all $v \in V(G_k) \setminus U_{k-1}$, v has a neighbor in U_{k-1}.*

Proof. If $v \in U_k$ then the result follows immediately from Lemma 3.1 part (ii). If $v \in U_r$, where $r \leq k-2$ then the result follows from Corollary 3.5. □

Lemma 3.7. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $r \leq k$, and for all $v \in U_r$,*

$$d_{G_k}(v) = \begin{cases} |P_k(v)| & \text{when } r > 1 \\ |P_k(v)| + 1 & \text{when } r = 1 \end{cases}$$

Proof. By the construction of G_{k+1}, there is a one-to-one corespondence between $P_k(v)$ and the $(k+1)$st generation neighbors of v. It follows that for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $r \leq k$, and for all $v \in U_r$,

$$d_{G_{k+1}}(v) = d_{G_k}(v) + |P_k(v)|.$$

We now prove the lemma by induction on k. If $k = 1$ then $r = 1$ and $d_{G_k}(v) = 2 = 1 + 1 = |P_k(v)| + 1$. If $k > 1$ and $r = 1$ then $d_{G_k}(v) = d_{G_{k-1}}(v) + |P_{k-1}(v)| = |P_{k-1}(v)| + 1 + |P_{k-1}(v)| = 2|P_{k-1}(v)| + 1 = |P_k(v)| + 1$ by inductive hypothesis and Lemma 3.3. If $k = 2$ and $r = 2$ then for the single vertex $v \in U_2$, $d_{G_k}(v) = 3 = |P_k(v)|$. If $k > 2$ and $r > 1$ then $d_{G_k}(v) = d_{G_{k-1}}(v) + |P_{k-1}(v)| = |P_{k-1}(v)| + |P_{k-1}(v)| = 2|P_{k-1}(v)| = |P_k(v)|$ by inductive hypothesis and Lemma 3.3. □

Corollary 3.8. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, for all $r \leq k$, and for all $v \in U_r$,*

$$d_{G_k}(v) = \begin{cases} 3(2^{k-r}) & \text{when } r > 1 \\ 2^{k-1} + 1 & \text{when } r = 1 \end{cases}$$

Proof. This follows immediately from Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.7. □

4 Upper Bounds for γ_e^*

In [3] the nonporous exponential dominating number of G, denoted $\gamma_e(G)$, is defined and the following theorem is proved:

Theorem 4.1. *(Dankelmann, et al) If G is a connected graph of order n, then $\gamma_e(G) \leq \frac{2}{5}(n+2)$.*

This theorem, together with Remark 1.1 and the fact that $\gamma_e^*(G) \leq \gamma_e(G)$, immediately establishes the following corollary:

Corollary 4.2. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq \frac{3^{k-1}+9}{5}$.*

The recursive nature of our construction of G_k makes it clear that for, $k > 1$, G_k can be conceived as a union of three copies of G_{k-1}. More precisely, if we consider the three triangles in G_2 that include the vertex in U_2, each could be the first generation of a copy of G_{k-1}. Together, these three copies of G_{k-1} comprise a copy of G_k. This perspective is also discussed in [9]. The following lemma follows immediately from this construction.

Lemma 4.3. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma_e^*(G_{k+1}) \leq 3\gamma_e^*(G_k)$.*

Corollary 4.4. *For $k \geq 5$, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq 2(3^{k-5})$.*

Proof. By induction on k. If $k = 5$ then the result follows immediately from Remark 1.4. If $k > 5$ then by Lemma 4.3, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq 3\gamma_e^*(G_{k-1}) = 3(2(3^{(k-1)-5})) = 2(3^{k-5})$ by inductive hypothesis. □

We now establish a better upper bound by proving Theorem 2.1:

Proof. Suppose $k \geq 6$. Let $S = U_{k-3}$ and compute $w_S^*(v)$ for all $v \in V(G_k)$.

Case 1: Suppose $v \in V(G_{k-4})$. By Corollary 3.5, v has a neighbor in S and $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$.

Case 2: Suppose $v \in U_{k-3}$. Then $v \in S$ and $w_S^*(v) \geq 2$.

Case 3: Suppose $v \in U_{k-2}$. By Corollary 3.6, v has a neighbor in S and $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$.

Case 4: Suppose $v \in U_{k-1}$ or $v \in U_k$. By Lemma 3.1, v has three distinct neighbors in $V(G_{k-1})$. If v has a neighbor in S then $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$. Otherwise, at least one of v's neighbors is in $V(G_{k-4})$. Let n be this vertex. By Corollary 3.4, n has more than one neighbor in S. Therefore, v is within distance 2 of at least two distinct vertices of S, and $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$.

We have shown that S is a porous exponential dominating set for G_k. By Remark 1.1, $|S| = 3^{k-5}$, and therefore $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq 3^{k-5}$. □

We proved Theorem 2.1 by using a particular generation as a porous exponential dominating set. For $k \geq 10$, we can improve this upper bound by using the entire vertex set of a smaller Apollonian network as a dominating set. This is the strategy we employ in the proof of Theorem 2.2:

Proof. Suppose $k \geq 10$. Let $S = V(G_{k-7})$ and compute $w_S^*(v)$ for all $v \in V(G_k)$.

Case 1: Suppose $v \in U_j$, $j \leq k-4$. Then by Corollary 3.2, either $v \in S$ or v has a neighbor in S. In both cases, $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$.

Case 2: Suppose $v \in U_j$, $k-3 \leq j \leq k-2$. If v has a neighbor in S, then $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$. Otherwise, by Corollary 3.2, v has a neighbor n in either U_{k-5} or U_{k-6}. By Lemma 3.1, n has at least two neighbors in S. Therefore, v is within distance 2 of at least two distinct vertices of S, and $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$.

Case 3: Suppose $v \in U_{k-1}$. If v has a neighbor in S, then $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$. Otherwise, by Corollary 3.2, v has a neighbor n in U_{n-4}, U_{n-5}, or U_{n-6}. By Corollary 3.2, n has a neighbor $w \in S$. If $w \in U_1$ then w has two neighbors $x, y \in U_1$. Note that $w, x, y \in S$, and that v is within distance 2 of w and within distance 3 of each of x and y. Therefore $w_S^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \geq 1$. Otherwise $w \in U_j$, $j \geq 2$, and by Lemma 3.1 w has three distinct neighbors $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in V(G_{j-1})$. Note that $w, x_1, x_2, x_3 \in S$, and that v is within distance 2 of w and within distance 3 of each of x_1, x_2, and x_3. Therefore $w_S^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \geq 1$.

Case 4: Suppose $v \in U_k$. If v has a neighbor in S, then $w_S^*(v) \geq 1$. Otherwise, by Corollary 3.2, v has a neighbor n in U_{n-3}, U_{n-4}, U_{n-5}, or U_{n-6}. By Corollary 3.2, n has a neighbor w such that $w \in U_{k-6}$ or $w \in S$. If $w \in S$ then proceed as in Case 3. If $w \in U_{k-6}$ then by Lemma 3.1 w has three distinct neighbors $x_1, x_2, x_3 \in S$. Let x_3 be the neighbor with smallest generation. Since $k \geq 10$, by Corollary 3.4 and Lemma 3.1 part (v), x_3 has at least 3 neighbors $y_1, y_2, y_3 \in U_{k-7}$ distinct from x_1 and x_2. Note that $x_1, x_2, x_3, y_1, y_2, y_3 \in S$. Also note that v is within distance 3 of each of x_1, x_2, and x_3, and within distance 4 of each of y_1, y_2, and y_3. Therefore $w_S^*(v) \geq \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8} + \frac{1}{8} \geq 1$.

We have shown that S is a porous exponential dominating set for G_k. By Remark 1.1, $|S| = \frac{3^{k-8}+5}{2}$, and therefore $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \leq \frac{3^{k-8}+5}{2}$. □

5 Lower Bound for γ_e^*

Recall that for a connected graph G, the diameter of G, denoted $diam(G)$, is the largest possible distance between a pair of vertices in G. In [3] the nonporous exponential domination number of G, denoted $\gamma_e(G)$, is defined and the following theorem is proven:

Theorem 5.1. *(Dankelmann, et al) If G is a connected graph, then $\gamma_e(G) \geq \left\lceil \frac{diam(G)+2}{4} \right\rceil$.*

In fact, the proof of this result in [3] is sufficient to establish the following lemma:

Lemma 5.2. *If G is a connected graph, then $\gamma_e^*(G) \geq \left\lceil \frac{diam(G)+2}{4} \right\rceil$.*

We now compute $diam(G_k)$ for every Apollonian network G_k.

Lemma 5.3. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $diam(G_{k+3}) \leq diam(G_k) + 2$.*

Proof. Suppose $x, y \in V(G_{k+3})$ and $d_{G_{k+3}}(x, y) = diam(G_{k+3})$. By Lemma 3.1 and Corollary 3.2, we know that x and y have neighbors u and v, respectively, in $V(G_k)$. It follows that

$$diam(G_{k+3}) = d_{G_{k+3}}(x, y) \leq d_{G_k}(u, v) + 2 \leq diam(G_k) + 2.$$

□

Corollary 5.4. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $diam(G_k) \leq \left\lfloor \frac{2k+1}{3} \right\rfloor$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k and show that $diam(G_k) \leq \frac{2k+1}{3}$. For $k = 1, 2, 3$, it is easy to verify that $diam(G_k) = 1, 1, 2$, respectively, and establish the desired result. For $k > 3$, by Lemma 5.3, $diam(G_k) \leq diam(G_{k-3}) + 2 \leq \frac{2(k-3)+1}{3} + 2 = \frac{2k+1}{3}$, by inductive hypothesis. Since $diam(G_k)$ is an integer, the result follows. □

Lemma 5.5. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ there exists $x, y \in U_k$ such that $d_{G_k}(x, y) = diam(G_k)$.*

Proof. First, observe that the statement is true for $k = 1$, so we may assume $k \geq 2$. Let $u, v \in V(G_k)$ such that $d_{G_k}(u, v) = diam(G_k)$. If $u \in U_k$ then let $x = u$. Otherwise, by Corollary 3.5, there exists $x \in U_k$ such that x is adjacent to u. If $v \in U_k$ then let $y = v$. Otherwise, by Corollary 3.5, there exists $y \in U_k$ such that y is adjacent to v. Let P be a shortest path joining x and y. Let w_1 be the vertex adjacent to x in P, and w_2 be the vertex adjacent to y in P. By Lemma 3.1 part (iii), u is adjacent to w_1 and v is adjacent to w_2. Define Q to be the path formed by replacing x and y in P with u and v. Then the length of Q is the same as the length of P. Since $d_{G_k}(u, v) = diam(G_k)$, this shows that the length of P is at least $diam(G_k)$. Since P is a shortest path joining x and y, $d_{G_k}(x, y) = diam(G_k)$. □

Lemma 5.6. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $diam(G_{k+3}) \geq diam(G_k) + 2$.*

Proof. The result is easily seen to be true for $k = 1$, so we may assume that $k \geq 2$. (See Figure 4 and Table 1.) By Lemma 5.5, let $u, v \in V(G_k)$ such that $d_{G_k}(u, v) = diam(G_k)$. By Lemma 3.1, any path joining u and v must include vertices from $V(G_{k-1})$. By Corollary 3.5, u has a neighbor u_1 in U_{k+1}. By the construction of G_{k+2}, u and u_1 have a common neighbor u_2 in U_{k+2}. By the construction of G_{k+3}, u, u_1, and u_2 have a common neighbor x in U_{k+3}. By Lemma 3.1, u, u_1, and u_2 are the only neighbors of x in G_{k+3}. Therefore, u has a neighbor $x \in U_{k+3}$ such that $N_{G_{k+3}}(x) \cap V(G_{k-1}) = \emptyset$. An analogous argument shows that v has a neighbor $y \in U_{k+3}$ such that $N_{G_{k+3}}(y) \cap V(G_{k-1}) = \emptyset$. Note that any path joining x and y must include vertices from $V(G_{k-1})$ because otherwise we could construct a path joining u and v without such vertices, which contradicts our earlier claim to the contrary.

Let P be a shortest path $x, w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_m, y$ joining x and y. Choose i as small as possible and j as large as possible such that $w_i, w_j \in V(G_{k-1}) \cap V(P)$. Since the only neighbors of x are u, u_1, and u_2 then w_i is adjacent to at least one of these. By the construction of G_{k+1} and G_{k+2}, u is adjacent to all of the neighbors of u_1 and u_2 in $V(G_{k-1})$, and therefore u is adjacent to w_i. Analogously, v is adjacent to w_j. Let Q be the path $u, w_i, w_{i+1}, \ldots, w_{j-1}, w_j, v$ joining u and v. Since $N_{G_{k+3}}(x) \cap V(G_{k-1}) = \emptyset$ and $N_{G_{k+3}}(y) \cap V(G_{k-1}) = \emptyset$, the length of P is at least 2 more than the length of Q. It follows that the length of P is at least $diam(G_k) + 2$. Since P is a shortest length path joining x and y, $diam(G_{k+3}) \geq diam(G_k) + 2$. □

Together, Lemma 5.3 and Lemma 5.6 imply the following result which was stated in [8] with greater generality but without a complete proof.

Corollary 5.7. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $diam(G_{k+3}) = diam(G_k) + 2$.*

Corollary 5.8. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $diam(G_k) \geq \lceil \frac{2k-1}{3} \rceil$.*

Proof. We proceed by induction on k and show that $diam(G_k) \geq \frac{2k-1}{3}$. For $k = 1, 2, 3$, it is easy to verify that $diam(G_k) = 1, 1, 2$, respectively, and establish the desired result. For $k > 3$, by Lemma 5.6, $diam(G_k) \geq diam(G_{k-3}) + 2 \geq \frac{2(k-3)-1}{3} + 2 = \frac{2k-1}{3}$, by inductive hypothesis. Since $diam(G_k)$ is an integer, the result follows. □

Corollary 5.9. *For all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $diam(G_k) = \lceil \frac{2k-1}{3} \rceil$.*

Proof. This result follows easily from Corollary 5.4, Corollary 5.8, and the fact that $\lfloor \frac{2k+1}{3} \rfloor = \lceil \frac{2k-1}{3} \rceil$, which the reader can easily check by cases $k \equiv 0, 1, 2 \pmod 3$. □

We can now prove Theorem 2.3:

Proof. By Corollary 5.9, $diam(G_k) = \lceil \frac{2k-1}{3} \rceil \geq \frac{2k-1}{3}$, and therefore $\frac{diam(G_k)+2}{4} \geq \frac{2k+5}{12}$. By Lemma 5.2, $\gamma_e^*(G_k) \geq \left\lceil \frac{diam(G_k)+2}{4} \right\rceil \geq \lceil \frac{2k+5}{12} \rceil$. □

6 Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank CURM, the Center for Undergraduate Research, for facilitating a wonderful undergraduate research experience and funding our research through NSF grant DMS-1148695. We would also like to thank Concord University for their encouragement and financial support.

References

[1] M. Anderson, R. Brigham, J. Carrington, R. Vitray, J. Yellen, On Exponential Domination of $C_m \times C_n$, *J. Graphs. Combin.* 6 No. 3 (2009) 341-351.

[2] J. Andrade, H. Herrmann, R. Andrade, L. Silva, Simultaneously Scale-Free, Small World, Euclidean, Space Filling, and with Matching Graphs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 94(1) (2005) 18702.

[3] P. Dankelmann, D. Day, D. Erwin, S. Mukwembi, H. Swart, Domination with Exponential Decay, *Discrete Math* 309(19) (2009) 58775883.

[4] J.P.K. Doye and C. Massen, Characterizing the network topology of the energy landscapes of atomic clusters *J. Chem. Phys.* 122 (2005) 84105.

[5] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, P.J. Slater, *Domination in Graphs: Advanced Topics*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.

[6] T.W. Haynes, S.T. Hedetniemi, P.J. Slater, *Fundamentals of Domination in Graphs*, Marcel Dekker, New York, 1998.

[7] D. B. West, *Introduction to Graph Theory, 2^{nd} ed.*, Prentice Hall, 2000.

[8] Z. Zhang, F. Comellas, G. Fertin, L. Rong, High Dimensional Apollonian Networks, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 39 (2006) 1811.

[9] Z. Zhang, B. Wu, and F. Comellas, The Number of Spanning Trees in Apollonian Networks, *Discrete Applied Mathematics.* (to appear)